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A shortage of trained child care teachers threatens the existing child care delivery system. Who Cares? Child Care Teachers and the Quality of Care in America is the report of the National Child Care Staffing Study, the most comprehensive examination of center-based child care in the United States in over a decade. It reveals that inadequate compensation is fueling a rapidly increasing and damaging exodus of trained personnel from our nation's child care centers. By failing to meet the needs of the adults who work in child care, we are threatening not only their well-being but that of the children in their care. These findings call for a national child care policy that provides increased compensation, improved work environments, and expanded educational opportunities for child care teachers.

INTRODUCTION

As the twentieth century draws to a close, public debate about child care in America has shifted. No longer is the question, "Should resources be allocated to these services?" Rather, discussion now focuses on what form support for child care will take. To date, pressures to expand the supply yet contain the cost to parents have shaped our public policies about child care. Financial considerations have consistently shortchanged efforts to improve child care services. Nevertheless, the supply of child care remains precarious and the fees for services lie beyond the means of many families.

Intention to quality has had its costs: child care centers throughout the country report difficulty in recruiting and retaining adequately trained staff. Nearly half of all child care teachers leave their jobs each year, many to seek better-paying jobs. As the nation deliberates on what is best for its children, the question of who will care for them grows increasingly critical.

A commitment to pay for quality requires an understanding of the ingredients demanded by quality. It is widely accepted that a developmentally appropriate environment—one with well-trained and consistent staff in sufficient numbers, moderately sized groupings of children, and proper equipment and activities—will lead to good care. But the fact is that child care staff are leaving their jobs at a rate almost three times higher than a decade ago. This high rate of turnover forces us to examine child care as a work environment for adults, and not just as a learning environment for children. In all work environments—from factories to hospitals—working conditions affect the quality of products produced or services provided. In child care, children's experience is directly linked to the well-being of their care givers. Good quality care requires an environment that values adults as well as children.

As a nation we are reluctant to acknowledge child care settings as a work environment for adults, let alone commit resources to improving them. Even though many Americans recognize that child care teachers are underpaid, outdated attitudes about women's work and the family obscure our view of teachers' economic needs and the demands of their work. If a job in child care is seen as an extension of women's familiar role of rearing children, professional preparation and adequate compensation seem unnecessary. Attributing child care skills to women's biological proclivities implies that teachers' jobs are more an avocation than an economic necessity. While such assumptions contradict the economic and educational realities facing those who teach in child care centers, they provide an unspoken rationale for depressing child care wages and containing costs.

Faced with a burgeoning demand for services, a pool of consumers with limited ability or inclination to pay the full cost of care, and restricted government and corporate funds, our nation has implicitly adopted a child care policy which relies upon unseen subsidies provided by child care teachers through their low wages. But as we are painfully realizing, this policy forms a shaky foundation upon which to build a structure to house and nurture our children while their parents earn a living.
HIGHLIGHTS OF MAJOR FINDINGS

Classroom observations, child assessments and interviews with center directors and teaching staff in 227 child care centers in five U.S. metropolitan areas provided the following information about child care teaching staff and the quality of care. Teaching staff includes all staff who provide direct care to children.

- The education of child care teaching staff and the arrangement of their work environment are essential determinants of the quality of services children receive.
- Teaching staff provided more sensitive and appropriate caregiving if they completed more years of formal education, received early childhood training at the college level, earned higher wages and better benefits, and worked in centers devoting a higher percentage of the operating budget to teaching personnel.
- The most important predictor of the quality of care children receive, among the adult work environment variables, is staff wages.
- The quality of services provided by most centers was rated as barely adequate. Better quality centers had:
  - higher wages
  - better adult work environments
  - lower teaching staff turnover
  - better educated and trained staff
  - more teachers caring for fewer children
- Better quality centers were more likely to be operated on a nonprofit basis, to be accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children, to be located in states with higher quality standards and to meet adult-child ratios, group size, and staff training provisions contained in the 1980 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements.
- Despite having higher levels of formal education than the average American worker, child care teaching staff earn abysmally low wages.
- This predominantly female work force earns an average hourly wage of $5.35.
- In the last decade, child care staff wages, when adjusted for inflation, have decreased more than 20%.
- Child care teaching staff earn less than half as much as comparably educated men and less than one-third as much as comparably educated men in the civilian labor force.
- Staff turnover has nearly tripled in the last decade, jumping from 15% in 1977 to 41% in 1988.
- The most important determinant of staff turnover, among the adult work environment variables, was staff wages.
- Teaching staff earning the lowest wages are twice as likely to leave their jobs as those earning the highest wages.
- Children attending lower-quality centers and centers with more staff turnover were less competent in language and social development.
- Low- and high-income children were more likely than middle-income children to attend centers providing higher quality care.
- Compared with a decade ago, child care centers in the United States receive fewer governmental funds, are more likely to be operated on a for-profit basis, and care for a larger number of infants.
(For a fuller discussion of the findings, see p. 8)

Improving the quality of center-based child care and addressing the staffing crisis demands the commitment of more public and private resources. The National Child Care Staffing Study findings suggest the following recommendations.

1. Raise child care teaching staff salaries as a means of recruiting and retaining a qualified child care work force.
2. Promote formal education and training opportunities for child care teaching staff to improve their ability to interact effectively with children and to create developmentally appropriate environments.
3. Adopt state and federal standards for adult-child
races, and staff education, training, and compensation in order to raise the floor of quality in America's child care centers.

4. Develop industry standards for the adult work environment to minimize the disparities in quality between types of child care programs.

5. Promote public education about the importance of adequately trained and compensated teaching staff in child care programs in order to secure support for the full cost of care.

GUIDE TO THE NATIONAL CHILD CARE STAFFING STUDY

NOTE: The following analysis was not used to test the model. After data were e.g., Teacher Characteristics, summary, we used multivariate analysis of variance to compare means with different categories, countries with United States, and middle, upper, and country for each variable. We used multiple regression techniques to test hypotheses regarding the number of purposes, expectations, and interactions between these components of center-based care.

This investigation targeted three major goals:

Goal #1. To examine relations among child care staff characteristics, adult work environments, and the quality of child care provided for children and families in center-based care.

Previous research suggests that if the ratio of group size did not rise above certain levels and if staff were trained in early childhood education, appropriate interactions between children and adults occurred, and, in turn, positive developmental outcomes for children were found. Thus, we expected that teachers with more professional preparation would be more likely to engage children in sensitive and appropriate interactions. We also hypothesized that teachers who taught in environments arranged to optimize child development would be more sensitive and appropriate with the children. We anticipated that children who participated in more sensitive and appropriate interaction with their teachers would be more socially and emotionally competent.

But we also wanted to extend this understanding of quality in light of the staffing crisis. We wanted to learn how the adult work environment affects the quality of care. We hypothesized that teachers who taught in child care centers with better work environments (particularly better compensation and working conditions) would be more satisfied with and committed to their careers, less likely to leave, and more likely to provide an appropriate child development environment for the children. We expected that children in centers with lower staff turnover would have more positive child care experiences.

Goal #2. To examine differences in child care quality, child care staff, and adult work environments in centers that varied with respect to standards, accreditation status, auspice, and the families served.
We hoped our investigation would shed light on the efficacy of child care standards, the pros and cons of various types of center care, and variation in services available to children from different family incomes. There are currently no federal regulations with which centers are required to comply, and state standards vary dramatically. But in the past decade, two bodies of guidance—the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR)² and the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) Center Accreditation Project—³ have been developed which reflect the most widely respected expert judgment about child care settings. In the absence of mandatory regulations, the FIDCR and the NAEYC provide the best voluntary standards by which to explore the relationship between quality and regulation. Thus, we compared the quality of accredited centers with the quality of non-accredited centers and the quality of those centers meeting selected FIDCR provisions with those that met none. Additionally, we compared the quality of centers in five states which each have very different child care regulations.

To examine how center type affects child care quality, reaching staff, and adult work environments, we compared child care centers operating under four different auspices: (1) Non-profit, non-church-run; (2) Non-profit, church-run, including synagogues; (3) For-profit chains, centers that are one of several operated by a single owner on a local or national basis; and (4) Independent, for-profit.

While parents are responsible for selecting child care, their choices are constrained by finances. We compared child care quality, reaching staff, and adult work environments of centers serving families from different socioeconomic backgrounds (high, middle, and low-income) in order to better understand which centers serve which families and the variation in quality.


In order to identify trends in center-based care over the last decade, we compared our findings to those of the National Day Care Supply Study conducted by Abt Associates in 1977.⁴

METHODOLOGY

The National Child Care Staffing Study examined the quality of care in 227 child care centers in five metropolitan areas in the United States: Atlanta, Boston, Detroit, Phoenix, and Seattle. In contrast to the 1977 National Day Care Supply Study that surveyed child care centers in every state by phone, the NCCSS examined extensively in these selected communities which represent the diversity of center-based care throughout the country. We began collecting data in February 1988 and finished in August 1988. Classroom observations and interviews with center directors and staff provided data on center characteristics, program quality, and staff qualifications, commitment, and compensation. In addition, in Atlanta, child assessments were conducted to examine the effects of varying program and staff attributes on children.

THE SAMPLE

We used a stratified random sampling strategy to generate a sample of child care centers that matched the proportion of licensed centers serving low-, middle-, and high-income families in urban and suburban neighborhoods in each Study site.⁵

FINAL SAMPLE OF PARTICIPATING CENTERS
(Based on income of families served)

![Final sample of participating centers](image-url)
Sixty-one percent of all eligible centers asked to be involved in the study agreed to participate. Refusal rates were higher among those centers in middle-income (42% refused) and high-income (38% refused) census tracts, than among those in low-income (23% refused) tracts. No differences in participation rates characterized urban and suburban centers. Centers were more likely to agree to participate if their legal status was non-profit (21% refused) rather than for-profit (39% of independent for-profits and 42% of chains refused).

**SAMPLE DESCRIPTION AUSPICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-profit Centers</th>
<th>Total = 120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business or hospital</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent cooperative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church-run</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For-profit Centers</th>
<th>Total = 107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independently operated</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of local or national chain</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Telephone screening interviews with center directors revealed that those who agreed to participate reported higher (i.e., better) staff-child ratios in their centers than did the directors who refused. This suggests that the final sample of 227 centers may, on average, consist of higher-quality centers than in the eligible population as a whole.

In each center, three classrooms were randomly selected for observation, one each from among all infant, toddler, and preschool classrooms. Only two classrooms were observed in some centers that did not enroll infants. Where possible, mixed-age classrooms were included to provide three classrooms per center.

**CLASSROOMS OBSERVED BY AGE OF CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Number of Classrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infants under 1 year</td>
<td>96/138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young toddlers (2-3 years)</td>
<td>76/123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older toddlers (4-5 years)</td>
<td>73/118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed ages</td>
<td>70/109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number after description indicates number of classrooms observed.

We randomly chose approximately two staff members from each participating classroom to interview and observe. In this report, "teachers" refers to teachers and teacher-directors. "Assistants" refers to assistant teachers and aides. Sixty-six percent (865) of the final sample of 1,309 teaching staff members were teachers (805 teachers and 60 teacher-directors) and 34% (444) were assistant teachers (286 assistant teachers and 158 aides).

Two children, a girl and a boy, were randomly selected for assessment from each target classroom in Atlanta. Two hundred and sixty children constituted the child sample: 53 infants, 97 toddlers and 110 preschoolers.

**THE MEASURES**

The complexity of the investigation required a varied approach to collecting data. On average, the research team in each site, consisting of trained observers and interviewers, spent three days in each center.

**Quality Observations**

The quality measures consisted of observations of classroom structure, overall quality, and interactions between the teaching staff and children.

Overall quality was assessed with the **Early Childhood**
ers and almost three-quarters of the teachers in our study had some college background.

EducatIonal Levels of Child Care Teaching Staff and of the Female Civilian Labor Force, Ages 25 - 64

Although, in 1988, more of the teaching staff had completed some college, fewer had received a college or graduate degree than in 1977.

Educational Levels of Teaching Staff: 1977 - 1988

Sixty-five percent of teachers and 57% of assistant teachers had some coursework in early childhood education or child development within the formal educational system—either at the high school, vocational school, college or graduate school level. Half of the teaching staff with specialized training had received it at the college level or above.

Our child care teaching staff was substantially more experienced in 1988 than in the past. Twenty-nine percent of the teachers and 58% of the assistants had been teaching in child care three years or less when interviewed. But 10% had been working in child care for 10 years or more. In 1977, only 5% had been in the field this long.

Professional Identification

Sixty-six percent of our teaching staff viewed child care as a career rather than as a temporary job. This was particularly true of those with specialized training in early childhood education. Even among those who left their current position, one-third stayed in the early childhood field.

Yet commitment to child care as a career did not translate into membership in professional organizations. Only 14% of the teaching staff belonged to a child-related professional group. Only 4% of the teaching staff were represented by a trade union. Teachers belonging to professional organizations had more formal education. Those belonging to either a professional organization or a union had more specialized training and experience, earned $1.50 more per hour, and were less likely to leave their jobs.

From Teacher Background to Teacher Behavior

Teachers with different educational backgrounds behaved differently with children. In general, the amount of formal education obtained by a teacher was the strongest predictor of appropriate teacher behavior, with specialized training emerging as an additional predictor in infant classrooms. The amount of experience did not predict teacher behavior. In all age classrooms, the teaching staff's level of formal education best predicted sensitive, less harsh, and less detached caregiving. Our findings differ from the National Day Care Study's 14 in which specialized child-related training, regardless of formal education, best predicted staff behavior.
THE WORK ENVIRONMENT FOR ADULTS

Teachers’ wages were the most important predictor in the adult work environment for both measures of quality associated with positive child development: Appropriate Developmental Environment scores and ratios. Teachers with higher salaries worked in centers with better environments for children. Wages and benefits were higher and working conditions better in centers that arranged for staff to have overlapping shifts. These findings suggest that when child care dollars are used to pay staff more, the quality of care for children is greatly enhanced.

COMPENSATION

Yet child care teaching staff constitute a very poorly paid workforce. The average hourly wage in 1988 was $5.35 which is an annual income of $9,363 for full-time (35 hours/50 week year-round) employment. The 1988 poverty threshold for a family of three (the average family size in our sample) was $9,431 a year. Fifty-seven percent of our sample earned $5 per hour or less. Most got no yearly cost-of-living or merit increases. A minimum wage of $4.55 per hour was proposed by Congress and vetoed by the President in 1989. Forty percent of the staff in our sample would now be paid more if it had been implemented.

| What Teachers Recommend To Improve Child Care Quality | 80% | 80% | 70% | 70% | 65% |
| Better salaries for child care work | | | | | |
| Improved benefits | | | | | |
| Increased social respect for child care work | | | | | |
| Ongoing or continuing education | | | | | |
| A career ladder in child care | | | | | |

Despite gains in overall formal education and experience, child care teaching staff were paid even less in 1988 than in 1977. Wages, when adjusted for inflation, dropped dramatically. Teachers’ earnings fell by 27 percent and assistants’ by 20 percent.


CHILD CARE TEACHING STAFF are typically paid to work year-round for 35 hours each week. The wages of child care teachers are essential to their family income. Forty-two percent of the teaching staff contributed at least half of their household income. One-quarter of the teachers contributed over two-thirds of their household earnings. To supplement their income, one-quarter of full-time teaching staff in 1988 worked a second job while only seven percent did so in 1977.
It is staggering how little child care staff can compare with what other comparably educated women in the work force earn. When child care wages in our study are compared with the wages of comparably educated men, the disparities are even more striking.

Child Care Teaching Staff Wages Versus Civilian Labor Force Wages (A)

Wages by Educational Level for Different Teaching Staff Positions

Most child care teachers, even full-time staff, received minimal employment benefits. Of the entire sample, two out of five received health coverage and one out of five had a retirement plan. Other than sick leave and paid holidays, the only benefit offered to a majority of the staff was reduced fees for child care. Teachers earning the lowest wages received the lowest benefits.

Working Conditions

The two-thirds of full-time teaching staff were paid, on average, for 40 hours per week. But they averaged an additional four hours per week preparing curriculum, fund-raising, or meeting with parents and staff for no pay.

Seventy percent of the teaching staff worked without a written contract. Forty percent had no written job description. Only four percent were protected by a collective bargaining agreement.

Job Satisfaction

Although dissatisfied with their compensation, teachers expressed very high levels of satisfaction with the day-to-day demands of their work. Their greatest sources of gratification included participating in the growth and devel-
opment of children, autonomy on the job, and relations with colleagues.

STAFF TURNOVER

Staff turnover rates were disturbingly high. Across all participating centers, directors reported an average, annual turnover rate of 41 percent. The follow-up calls revealed a staff turnover rate of 37 percent over just six months. The number of directors reporting no staff turnover in their center plummeted between 1977 and 1988.

TEACHING STAFF TURNOVER: 1977 - 1988

How the Adult Work Environment Affects Turnover

The most important predictor of staff turnover, among the adult work environment variables, was staff wages. In centers paying lower wages, directors reported a larger share of their teaching staff had left in the last 12 months. The follow-up telephone calls to the teaching staff confirmed these reports - actual turnover rates were higher in centers paying lower wages. Teaching staff earning $4 per hour or less left their jobs at twice the rate of those who earned over $5. Close to three-quarters of those who left found better-paying jobs in early childhood or other fields.

TURNOVER RATES FOR TEACHING STAFF WITH DIFFERING WAGES (SIX-MONTH TURNOVER)

How Turnover Affects Children

Turnover is detrimental to children. Children in centers with higher turnover rates spent less time engaged in social activities with peers and more time in aimless wandering. They also had lower Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test scores compared with children in centers with more stable teaching staff.
CHARACTERISTICS OF CENTERS

Between 1977 and 1988, the average center enrollment increased from 49 to 84 children. Accordingly, the average number of care givers per center increased from 8 to 15. For-profit centers constituted 41% of centers in 1977 as compared with 47% of the centers participating in the National Child Care Staffing Study. For-profit centers’ share of total enrollment also rose from 37% in 1977 to 51% in 1988. Government funding as a proportion of total revenues dropped from 29% in 1977 to 17% in 1988.

The racial composition of the children shifted in the last decade. While there were slightly more whites (63% v. 70%) and fewer blacks (28% v. 21%) in 1988, there were more non-whites from other racial groups (9% v. 13%). The age composition of the children also changed dramatically. In 1977, 14% of the enrolled children were infants and toddlers (two years old or younger). In 1988, this figure had grown to 30%. Thus, the proportion of preschoolers shifted, dropping from 52% to 46% and the proportion of kindergartners and school-age children dropped from 35% to 23%.

CHILD CARE ENVIRONMENTS

Centers in our sample provided a very wide range of child development environments. Quality varied widely for each of our child development environment measures: the Developmentally Appropriate Activity score derived from Environment Rating Scales, Ratings, and Group Sizes.

Developmentally Appropriate Activity

The average Developmentally Appropriate Activity scores were 3.17, 3.57, and 3.56 for infant, toddler, and preschool classrooms, respectively. A score of 3 indicates “minimally adequate” care on this measure; a score of 5 indicates “good” care, placing the average classroom in the sample at a barely adequate level of quality. At least two-thirds of the classrooms, for all ages of children, fell below a scale score of 4, and, at most, 12% of the classrooms met or exceeded the “good” score of 5.

Ratios

The Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements recommended ratios of 3 infants to 1 adult, 5 toddlers to 1 adult, and 10 preschoolers to 1 adult. On average, we observed ratios of 3.9 infants to 1 adult, 5.8 toddlers to 1 adult, and 8.4 preschoolers to 1 adult. While we observed 3:1 ratios in 36% of the infant classrooms, 30% of the classrooms had ratios of 5:1 or worse. For toddlers, 46% of the classrooms had ratios of 5:1 or better, but 22% had ratios of 8:1 or worse. Preschoolers fared better; 76% of their classrooms had ratios of 10:1 or better and only 7.4% had ratios of 15:1 or worse.

Group Size

The FIDCR recommends group sizes of no more than 10 infants to two-and-a-half-year-olds, 16 two and a half to four-year-olds and 20 four to six year-olds. On average, we observed group sizes of 7.1 for infants (under 1 year old), 9.6 for toddlers (1 and 2 year-olds) and 13.5 for preschoolers. Eighty-nine percent of the infant classrooms, 63% of the toddler classrooms, and 71% of the preschool classrooms had group sizes coinciding with the FIDCR recommendations.

Staffing Patterns

Most centers change their staffing arrangements during the course of the day. Between nine A.M. and five P.M., one teacher was alone with the children in 55% of infant and toddler classes and 57% of preschool classrooms. Working alone, an infant teacher cared for 3 to 8 children, a toddler teacher cared for 3 to 14 children and a preschool teacher cared for 6 to 22 children. In approximately 15% of the classrooms, staff had no overlap at the beginnings and ends of their shifts, and thus no opportunity to communicate information about the children.

TEACHER-CHILD INTERACTION

The average Appropriate Caregiving scores were 4.15, 4.10, and 4.39 for infant, toddler, and preschool classrooms, respectively. This places the average caregiving in classrooms for all ages of children below a level of quality
that indicates "good" care (a score of 5) on this scale. About 30% of all classrooms met or exceeded the "good" score of 5.

From Quality Environments to Teacher Behavior

Teachers in environments with high Developmentally Appropriate Activity ratings and lower Ratios (i.e., better) were more Sensitive, less Harsh and less Detached when interacting with the children. Contrary to previous studies, group size did not predict teacher behavior.

COMPARISON WITH QUALITY GUIDELINES

Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements

How do centers that meet an acceptable threshold of quality differ from those which don't? To answer this question, every participating child care center was compared according to how they met the three major provisions of the 1980 FIDCR: ratios, group size, and teacher training. Centers that met all three provisions had staff with more formal education, higher levels of early childhood education training, and more experience. They also had more Developmentally Appropriate Activity for all ages of children.

Teachers in centers meeting the FIDCR provisions were more Sensitive, less Harsh, and engaged in more Appropriate Caregiving with the children, thus suggesting that standards may contribute to the creation of a warm and caring child care environment.

Centers meeting the FIDCR provisions paid better wages and provided better benefits, except for reduced fees for child care. Teaching staff in these centers reported higher levels of job satisfaction. Finally, directors reported higher staff turnover in centers that did not meet the FIDCR provisions. Centers meeting the FIDCR provisions charged higher parent fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARISON OF WAGES, BENEFITS, AND TURNOVER IN CENTERS THAT MET THE FEDERAL INTERAGENCY DAY CARE REQUIREMENTS' (FIDCR) PROVISIONS FOR RATIOS, GROUP SIZE, AND TRAINING</th>
<th>Centers Meeting No FIDCR Provisions Only</th>
<th>Centers Meeting All FIDCR Provisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Hourly Wage</td>
<td>$4.43</td>
<td>$6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Turnover (Directors Report)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Receiving Health Benefits</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Days of Sick Leave</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>6 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Receiving Retirement Benefits</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Receiving Cost-of-Living Adjustments</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Receiving Reduced Fee for Child Care</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Data are not available.
B. 21% of centers met all, 89% met none, but 11% met no FIDCR provisions.
C. Includes partial and fully paid health benefits.

State Regulations

Sites vary dramatically in the proportion of centers that met or failed to meet the FIDCR provisions. This variation corresponds to the stringency of state child care standards. Boston has very rigorous child care regulations whereas Phoenix and Atlanta have among the most lax. In Boston, 66% of centers met all of the FIDCR provisions; every center met some of the provisions. In contrast, only 7% of the Phoenix centers met some of the provisions and 20% failed to meet any. Centers in Boston had higher Developmentally Appropriate Activity scores than did centers in Phoenix or Atlanta. There was a strong relation between state regulations and observed ratios. Centers in Phoenix and Atlanta had worse ratios than centers in other sites for children of all ages.

Accreditation

Fourteen of the 227 centers in each of our sites had completed the center accreditation process sponsored by the National Association for the Education of Young
Children. These centers had staff with more formal education, higher levels of early childhood education training, and more experience than non-accredited centers. Accredited centers had more Developmentally Appropriate Activity, more classroom staff, and better infant and toddler ratios. Teachers were more Sensitive and engaged in more Appropriate Caregiving.

Accredited centers paid better wages and, with the exception of reduced fee child care, provided more benefits. Accredited centers were also more likely to provide regular cost-of-living increases, paid preparation time and written job descriptions. Staff in accredited centers reported higher levels of satisfaction with supervisor and director relations but lower levels of satisfaction with their ability to resolve their own work and family conflicts. Although accredited centers did not charge parents higher fees than non-accredited centers, they did serve children from higher-income families.

Auspices

Differences characterized the four types of centers: independent, for-profit, chain, for-profit, nonprofit, and church-sponsored. Educational levels and early childhood training were higher for teachers in non-profit centers than for teachers in either type of for-profit or church centers. Staff in non-profit centers had more experience than staff in for-profit centers.

Non-profit centers had more Developmentally Appropriate Activity than did independent, for-profit centers. Non-profit centers also had better ratios than either type of for-profit center. They had more teaching staff in the classroom than any other auspice and were more likely to have two adults in a classroom at any given time than either type of for-profit center. Non-profits were more likely to arrange overlapping shifts for staff than were for-profit centers.

Teachers in non-profit centers were more likely to engage in Appropriate Caregiving than were teachers in the other types of centers. Teachers in independent, for-profit centers were more Harsh and less Sensitive than teachers in other programs.

Non-profit and church centers paid higher wages than did either type of for-profit center. Non-profit centers provided better employment benefits, with the exception of reduced fees for child care, than did church and for-profit centers, and church centers provided better benefits than did independent, for-profit centers.

Both the six-month teacher turnover and the directors’ report of the previous 12-month turnover were higher in for-profit centers than in non-profit centers.

WAGES, BENEFITS, AND TURNOVER IN CENTERS OF DIFFERENT AUSPICES (A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chain, forprofit</th>
<th>Independent, forprofit</th>
<th>Non-profit church-sponsored</th>
<th>Non-profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Hourly Wage</td>
<td>54.10</td>
<td>54.76</td>
<td>55.04</td>
<td>56.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Turnover (Directors' Report)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Receiving Health Benefits (B)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Days of Sick Leave</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Receiving Unemployment Benefits</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Receiving Cost-of-living Adjustments</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Receiving Item Increases</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Receiving Reduced Fee for Child Care</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A These data are staff reports. It includes partial and full benefits.

These different types of centers have the same financial resources but receive funds in different proportions. Non-profit centers received a smaller proportion of their incomes from parent fees (69%), compared with church-run (83%) centers and both types of for-profit (87%) centers. The percentage of income from government funds accounted for this difference, with the non-profits receiving 33% of their budget from this source. Partly as a result of this subsidy, non-profit centers had significantly larger overall budgets than did the other centers, controlling for
total enrollment and proportion of full-time enrollment. Combined corporate and charitable funding accounted for just seven percent of any type of centers income. The fees that parents paid for child care differed dramatically by site and by age of child but not by auspice.

**MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM WEEKLY FEES FOR FULL-TIME CHILDREN**

![Chart showing minimum and maximum fees for infants, toddlers, and preschoolers.]

**NOTE:** The minimum and maximum fees for each age group represent the lowest and highest average parent full-time fee found in a single participating site. The maximum fee is consistently charged in Boston. Atlanta and Phoenix charge the lowest fees.

Even when budgets were adjusted for differences in contributed space, total enrollment, and proportion of full-time enrollment, both types of non-profit centers spent a higher proportion of their budgets on teaching staff than did for-profits. Non-profit and church-run centers allocated 62% and 63% of their budgets to teaching staff salaries and benefits, respectively. For-profit centers, independents, and chains allocated 49% and 41%, respectively. Similar trends were found for percentages of budgets devoted to total personnel costs.

A final distinction among the differing auspices concerns the socioeconomic status of their clientele as reported by center directors. Children from low-income families were most likely to be in non-profit centers. In contrast, children from middle-income families were disproportionately found in for-profit centers. Children from high-income families were found primarily in non-profit centers and, to a lesser extent, in independent, for-profit centers. Church-sponsored centers tended to serve children from low- and middle-income families.

What do these differences among centers tell us about quality? Auspice was the strongest predictor of quality. The second predictor of quality for infants and toddlers was whether or not a center met the FIDCR provisions. The second predictor of quality for preschoolers was NAEYC accreditation. The presence of government funds had little predictive value. Non-profit centers, regardless of whether they received government funds, provided better quality care than for-profit centers that did or did not receive government funds.

**FAMILY INCOME AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CARE**

Across numerous indicators of quality, we found that children from middle-income families were enrolled in centers of lower quality than were children from low- and high-income families. Children from middle-income families were found in centers with worse staff-child ratios, lower staff wages, and fewer staff with specialized training.

Accordingly, children from middle-income families were more likely to be in classrooms that were observed to offer less Developmentally Appropriate Activity and Appropriate Caregiving, with only one exception. Preschoolers from middle-income families were in classrooms with higher ratings of Appropriate Caregiving than were preschoolers from low-income (but not high-income) families. Children from high-income families experienced lower rates of staff turnover than did children from the two lower-income groups.

These patterns in quality of care correspond to income differences in parent fees. High-income families paid the highest fees, regardless of their child's age. But, non-subsidized, low-income families paid somewhat higher fees than did middle-income families.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Without major improvements in their salaries and working conditions, qualified teachers will continue to leave the child care field for jobs that offer a living wage. Action is required at many different levels of society to meet the challenge of improving the adult work environment in child care and thus the developmental environment for millions of children.

Parents are the starting point. They have the highest stake in improving the stability and quality of care for their children. They can intervene to improve services by demanding that federal and state governments, as well as industry, increase their commitment of resources. Early childhood education professional organizations, resource and referral agencies, direct service providers, training institutions, advocates and, of course, teachers have an important role to play in upgrading the quality of America's child care.

Five major recommendations emerged from the findings of the National Child Care Staffing Study. The first three recommendations, focusing on public and private resource allocation and regulation, are directed toward federal and state governments and employers. The last two recommendations are aimed at providers of direct and support services to child care, including businesses, and involve redefining practices and priorities within the early childhood education field. Suggestions about how to achieve these changes are listed below each recommendation.

1. Increase child care teacher salaries to recruit and retain a qualified child care work force.
   - Establish salary levels that are competitive with other occupations requiring comparable education and training.
   - Earmark funds for salary enhancement in all new and current federal and state allotments for child care.
   - Increase the federal minimum wage and ensure that it covers all child care teachers in order to raise the salary floor in child care centers.

2. Promote formal education and training opportunities for child care teachers to improve their ability to interact effectively with children and to create developmentally appropriate environments.
   - Develop career ladders in child care programs to reward education and training and encourage continuing education for all levels of teaching staff.
   - Include resources for specialized early childhood education training in all new public and private funding for child care.
   - Expand current federal and state college loan deferment programs for elementary and secondary school teachers to include early childhood teachers seeking specialized training at the college level.
   - Establish a national training fund to provide education stipends to individuals currently employed in a child care setting and seeking two-year and graduate degrees in early childhood education.

3. Adopt state and federal standards for adult-child ratios, staff training, education, and compensation in order to raise the floor of quality in American child care centers.
4. Develop industry standards for the adult work environment to minimize the disparities in quality between types of child care programs.
   - Devote a minimum of 60% of center budgets to teaching personnel expenditures in order to maintain adequate salaries and to reduce turnover.
   - Provide an employment benefits package for all teaching personnel which includes paid health coverage, a retirement plan, paid sick leave, vacations and holidays, and an annual cost-of-living adjustment.
   - Implement policies that include regularly scheduled paid time for curriculum perpetuation, staff meetings and in-service training.
   - Charge higher fees for services and create sliding fee schedules to assure equity in the percentage of family budgets dedicated to child care expenses.
   - Encourage child care teachers to join professional organizations and unions committed to improving their compensation and working conditions.
   - Create sliding fee scale membership rates to encourage lower-paid child care teachers to join professional organizations.

5. Promote public education about the importance of adequately trained and compensated teachers in child care programs to secure support for the full cost of care.
   - Include information about the significance of the adult work environment in all child care training programs.
CONCLUSION

Amidst the child care debate facing our nation, a consensus is emerging that high quality early childhood services are essential to the developmental and economic wellbeing of our children and families. The National Child Care Staffing Study raises serious concerns about the quality of services many American children receive. But our findings also clearly indicate how services can be improved if, as a society, we will devote the necessary resources to accomplishing this. America depends on child care teachers. Our future depends on valuing them.

Footnotes


2. In 1980, the Federal government adopted, and almost immediately rescinded, the FDICR which contains three regulated ingredients of quality: the ratio of children per adult care giver, the group size in classrooms, and the child-related training of the teaching staff. We compared centers in our sample which met with FDICR standards along those identified dimensions with those that did not. Federal Register, Part V, Volume 45, No. 55, Wednesday, March 19, 1980. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of the Secretary, H.E.W. Day Care Regulations, pp. 17870-17885.

3. The NAEYC is the largest early childhood education professional association. NAEYC operates a voluntary, nationwide accreditation program for all early childhood center-based programs. After a thorough review, centers that meet certain standards of care receive accredited status. Accreditation Criteria & Procedures of the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, Sue Bredekamp, Editor; National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1984; pp. 1-2.


5. First, the eligible pool of centers was identified from updated lists of licensed child care centers. Eligible centers, in addition to being licensed, provided full-time, non-residential child care for at least 9 months per year, enrolled at least 15 children, and employed at least 6 teaching staff members. Second, the final sample of participating centers was selected from this eligible pool. This selection used a stratified, random sampling strategy. Specifically, the eligible pool of centers in each site was divided into six groups based on their location in (i) low-, middle-, or high-income Census tracts (using site-specific median incomes to establish
income cut-offs), and (2) urban or suburban neighborhoods. The final sample of centers was then randomly selected, using replacement sampling to handle refusals, to reach the proportion of eligible centers in each of these six income and density groups. Thus, if 30% of the eligible centers in a site were located in low-income, urban neighborhoods, 30% of the final sample for that site consisted of centers in low-income, urban neighborhoods.


13To make comparisons between the Supply Study of the National Day Care Study and the National Child Care Staffing Study, the proportion of centers that (1) were profit versus non-profit and (2) enrolled or did not enroll subsidized children more versus less than 5 or 20% of enrollment versus more than 5 or 20% of enrollment were made equivalent in the two samples using a weighting procedure.
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